Pages 1 - 39

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BEFORE THE HONORABLE CHARLES R. BREYER, JUDGE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

VS. No. CR 18-00577 CRB

MICHAEL RICHARD LYNCH and STEPHEN KEITH CHAMBERLAIN,

Defendants.) San Francisco, California

Monday, February 4, 2019

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff: DAVID L. ANDERSON

United States Attorney

450 Golden Gate Avenue, 11th Floor San Francisco, California 94102

BY: ADAM A. REEVES

ROBERT S. LEACH WILLIAM FRENTZEN

ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

For Defendant Chamberlain:

BIRD MARELLA BOXER WOLPER NESSIM

DROOKS LINCENBERG RHOW 1875 Century Park East

23rd Floor

Los Angeles, California 90067-2561

BY: GARY S. LINCENBERG, ESQ.

Reported By: BELLE BALL, CSR 8785, CRR, RDR

Official Reporter, U.S. District Court

(Appearances continued, next page)

APPEARANCES, CONTINUED:

For Defendant Lynch:

STEPTOE & JOHNSON, LLP 1330 Connecticut Avenue, NW Washington, D.C. 20036-1795

BY: REID H. WEINGARTEN, ESQ. BRIAN M. HEBERLIG, ESQ.

CLIFFORD CHANCE US LLP 31 West 52nd Street

New York, New York 10019-6131

BY: CHRISTOPHER J. MORVILLO, ESQ.

Monday - February 4, 2019

4:18 p.m.

, **|**|

PROCEEDINGS

THE CLERK: Calling Criminal Action CR-18-0577, USA versus Michael Richard Lynch and Stephen Keith Chamberlain. Counsel, please state your appearances.

MR. REEVES: Adam Reeves, Robert Leach and William Frentzen for the United States. Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. WEINGARTEN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. It's Reid Weingarten, Chris Morvillo, Brian Heberlig, for Dr. Lynch.

MR. LINCENBERG: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Gary Lincenberg specially appearing for Mr. Chamberlain, who is present in court.

THE COURT: Specially appearing. What's that about? What do you mean, you're specially appearing?

MR. LINCENBERG: Just trying to work out the remaining details, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well, I don't want to pry, but it seems to me that in a criminal case -- he's here, so I -- see, he's here, you're not? Let me just deal with that one. I don't think it quite works like that.

MR. LINCENBERG: Well, Your Honor, obviously I'm here.

And there's some issues to be worked out which, if the Court wanted to pry --

THE COURT: No, I don't want to pry. And that's -- okay.

So in other words, your special appearance is not related to 1 jurisdictional issues. 2 MR. LINCENBERG: Correct. 3 THE COURT: Okay, I'm sorry. 4 5 MR. LINCENBERG: Correct. THE COURT: That's what I thought it was, and then I was 6 7 trying to figure out whether we're going get into some jurisdictional issue. But if the arrangements are that -- if 8 your special appearance is dictated by coming to appropriate 9 terms with your client, that's fine. Okay, there's no problem 10 11 with that at all. That happens all the time. Okay. 12 you. 13 So we have you here. We don't have Dr. Lynch here. 14 (Reporter interruption) 15 Yeah, defendant. Right. THE COURT: Sorry. So, let's deal with first, Mr. Chamberlain and then we'll deal with 16 17 Dr. Lynch. (Defendant Chamberlain present, not in custody) 18 19 My understanding is the -- Mr. Chamberlain is here as a 20 result of an agreement with the government. Oh, I don't know; 21 you're here as a result of the indictment. But that you came here voluntarily, and submitted yourself to the jurisdiction of 22 23 the Court. And I don't know whether or not any terms of your release 24

have been worked out. But as I -- I think that, as -- well,

```
first of all, I think the government has made representations
 1
     on the Court's behalf that your voluntary appearance will
 2
     result in a -- what I will call a nominal bail, an agreement
 3
 4
     with standard conditions that would permit you -- I quess I
 5
     still have it on my desk somewhere --
          MR. REEVES: We have agreed to release conditions,
 6
     Your Honor.
 7
          THE COURT: All right. So, do -- has that form been
 8
     executed?
 9
                            I propose that we arraign
10
          MR. REEVES: No.
11
     Mr. Chamberlain, and that we then set the release conditions,
     which are identical to those for Mr. Hussain.
12
13
          THE COURT: Okay, I think that's fine. I see no problem
     with that.
14
15
          (Document tendered)
16
          MR. REEVES: Thank you.
17
          THE COURT: So Mr. Chamberlain, you have been charged in a
     grand jury indictment with a violation of 18 U.S.C. 1349,
18
19
     conspiracy to commit wire fraud; 18 U.S.C. Section 1343, wire
     fraud; and 18 U.S.C. Section 2, aiding and abetting. As well
20
     as several charges that there ought to be a forfeiture or
21
     criminal forfeiture with respect to certain property.
22
23
          I now turn to the United States to complete the
     arraignment.
24
25
                       Yes, Your Honor.
          MR. REEVES:
```

Mr. Chamberlain and one other co-defendant have been charged in a 15-count indictment that specifically alleges that in or about -- beginning in or about January, 2009, and continuing through in or about October, 2011, the defendants, including Mr. Chamberlain, together with others, including former chief financial officer Sushovan Hussain, engaged in a fraudulent scheme to deceive purchasers and sellers of Autonomy securities about the performance -- about the true performance of Autonomy's business, its financial performance and condition, the nature and composition of its products, revenue and expenses, and its prospects for growth.

I'll read one more paragraph of the indictment,
Your Honor, Paragraph 20.

(Off-the-Record discussion between counsel)

MR. REEVES: It's a 14-count indictment, not a 15-count indictment. I stand corrected.

Paragraph 20 in the indictment alleges as follows: That the objectives of the scheme to defraud were, among other things, (a), to ensure that Autonomy reported that if it had met or exceeded projected quarterly results for, among other things, revenue, gross margin, net income, and earnings per share, (b), to maintain and increase the defendants' positions within the company, and to enrich themselves and others through bonuses, salaries and options, and (c), to artificially increase and maintain the share price of Autonomy securities

to, among other things, make Autonomy attractive to potential 1 2 purchasers. Would you like me to read the maximum penalties? 3 THE COURT: Yes, please. 4 5 The maximum penalties for a conviction of MR. REEVES: conspiracy in violation of U.S.C. 1349 and for wire fraud in 6 7 violation of 18 U.S.C. 1343 are a 20-year term of imprisonment; a \$250,000 fine or twice the gross gain or loss, whichever is 8 greater; a three-year term of supervised release; a \$100 9 special assessment; and restitution and asset forfeiture in 10 11 amounts to be determined by the Court. Thank you. 12 13 THE COURT: Mr. Chamberlain, have you received a copy of the indictment? 14 15 **DEFENDANT CHAMBERLAIN:** Yes. Yes, I have, Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: And you understand the nature of the charges. 17 Do you wish to plead at this time? **DEFENDANT CHAMBERLAIN:** Yes. Not quilty, Your Honor. 18 19 THE COURT: Okay. As to all counts. 20 DEFENDANT CHAMBERLAIN: That's correct, yes. THE COURT: All right. And let me caution you that you 21 need not make any statements in connection with any of the 22 matters that are subject to the grand jury indictment. 23 You are, of course, entitled to counsel. You have able 24

counsel next to you. But of course, if you can't afford

counsel, or if you choose other counsel -- first, if you can't afford counsel, then counsel will be appointed by the Court.

But you can select counsel of your own choosing. And I assume that's what you will do in this matter.

DEFENDANT CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, of course, this case comes with a history. Most cases do. But this one has a pretty extensive one, since we have already had a full jury trial of a co-defendant. And I think I need to have some discussion as to what is appropriate in terms of time with respect to trial preparation. I'm assuming, of course, that the case is going to go to trial. No reason to believe it won't. But I need to set some dates so that the case moves on.

And before I discuss with your counsel prospective dates,

I want to find out what is happening with respect to Dr. Lynch.

MR. LINCENBERG: Did the Court want to set conditions of bond?

THE COURT: Oh, yes, the standard -- where are they?

MR. REEVES: The parties have agreed to release conditions for Mr. Chamberlain that are identical to Mr. Hussain's. Specifically, a \$1,000 cash bond, and that travel be authorized to the United Kingdom where Mr. Chamberlain resides, and to the United States, and to any other country where there is an extradition treaty with the United States.

THE COURT: Okay. Also the standard condition, isn't it,

that he will not commit -- he will not commit a federal, state 1 or local criminal offense. 2 MR. REEVES: That's correct, Your Honor. That he agrees 3 to appear at all proceedings as ordered by the Court; that he 4 5 not commit any other crimes, et cetera; that he not harass, 6 threaten, intimidate, injure, tamper with other parts of the 7 case; and that there be travel restrictions. It would be those four restrictions. 8 9 MR. LINCENBERG: (Nods head) THE COURT: Okay. With respect to those conditions, what 10 11 I'm particularly concerned about is, since you won't be residing in the Northern District of California, is your 12 13 willingness to come to the Northern District to appear at all court -- at any court proceeding in which you are directed to 14 15 appear. 16 Do you understand that? 17 **DEFENDANT CHAMBERLAIN:** Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: In other words, there will be -- you're an 18 19 attorney, aren't you? 20 MR. LINCENBERG: No. **DEFENDANT CHAMBERLAIN:** 21 No. No, you're not an attorney, okay. 22 23 MR. REEVES: He's an accountant, Your Honor.

THE COURT: An accountant, okay. There will be, from time

to time, court proceedings. Under our laws, you are entitled

24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
to be present at all court proceedings. There isn't going to
be a secret proceeding involving your case, with respect to
your not being present.
     So it's important for the Court's consideration, moving
the case forward and setting dates and so forth, that I have
your agreement that upon notification either by the Court or by
your counsel that you are required to appear at a particular
date and time -- and I certainly will make sure that you get
adequate notice -- that you will appear.
     Is that of concern to you?
     DEFENDANT CHAMBERLAIN: No. Not at all, Your Honor.
     THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?
     MR. REEVES: Not for the government, Your Honor.
                Okay, so I guess I -- I don't do arraignments,
     THE COURT:
but -- that may be obvious from the way I conducted this one.
     But does Mr. Chamberlain sign a piece of paper or
something to that --
     MR. REEVES: We are going to prepare the bond right now.
     THE COURT:
                Yes.
     MR. REEVES: And he will sign it, and we'll give it to the
courtroom deputy.
                Okay. So I now can go past this temporarily
and find out what is happening with Dr. Lynch.
     MR. LINCENBERG:
                      Thank you, Your Honor.
     DEFENDANT CHAMBERLAIN:
                             Thank you.
```

1 MR. REEVES: Thank you. 2 (Document tendered) Mr. Weingarten? THE COURT: 3 MR. WEINGARTEN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 4 5 Good afternoon. THE COURT: MR. WEINGARTEN: So when I was last here, the Court gave 6 7 us some time over the holidays and instructed us to come back with a status report. 8 9 The two headlines of the status report are first, as you may recall, there's a civil trial about to start in London. 10 And the issue for us was whether or not we would seek a stay. 11 12 And we've chosen not to. 13 So the civil trial begins next month, and steady as she 14 goes, in London, on the civil trial between HP and Mike Lynch. 15 Number two --16 THE COURT: Begins when? March? 17 MR. WEINGARTEN: End of March. End of March. Okay. 18 THE COURT: MR. WEINGARTEN: And, and, you know, they do things 19 somewhat differently there. There's some estimates that the 20 trial could be eight or nine months. 21 22 THE COURT: Okay. 23 MR. WEINGARTEN: Number two, we were in London a couple of weeks ago to visit with the client, to sort of tie up loose 24 ends about this appearance. He did not appear well. We urged 25

him to go to the doctor. He did. He had emergency surgery.

The surgery was successful, but he is under constant care.

If the Court wishes to have more detail, we would like to respect his privacy, and present that information to the Court privately.

THE COURT: Well, is his health such that he's prohibited from traveling?

MR. WEINGARTEN: Yes. For now. We're hopeful -- we're hopeful that everything will be fine. But certain- -- the doctor's certainly instructed him post-surgery -- and the surgery was last week -- that he was not to travel for at least three weeks.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, as to that, I think that what I need is a declaration which could be filed under seal, from his medical specialist, describing his medical condition.

MR. WEINGARTEN: Sure.

THE COURT: And in addition, also setting forth what in the doctor's opinion is the time that he will be able to travel to the United States for -- or San Francisco for a one-day appearance in this court.

MR. WEINGARTEN: Sure. And I'm hopeful that -- and our fingers are crossed -- that all will be well and this won't be an issue going forward. But I just wanted to report to you.

THE COURT: Well, of course. It's obvious. Yes, of course.

1 MR. WEINGARTEN: And I'm happy to share with the Court 2 today the details. THE COURT: Well, I don't know that I need to know the 3 details today. I think the doctor can --4 5 MR. WEINGARTEN: Sure. THE COURT: -- or doctors can submit that report. 6 7 MR. WEINGARTEN: There's one other issue that I would like 8 9 THE COURT: Is it your position -- are you telling me that it is the medical -- that the medical condition is the 10 11 impediment to his coming to court now? MR. WEINGARTEN: I think it will be clear when I get to 12 13 this next -- I'm simply reporting what has happened since I 14 last saw you. 15 Go ahead. THE COURT: 16 MR. WEINGARTEN: Okay. So I want to talk very, very 17 briefly about the E word, extradition. And I want to preface 18 it with the following. Mike Lynch has faith in the American justice system. 19 20 he wants to be vindicated here. What is also true, with 30 21 seconds' worth of background -- historically, the Brits have been very quick to extradite British people to the United 22 23 States if Uncle Sam asks them to do so. That is changing. Brits passed a law that talked about a forum bar, meaning that 24

in cases where even when the United States has jurisdiction, if

there are more ties to England, the courts in England are capable under the law now saying no to the United States. And recently, they have done just that.

There are barristers in England that have said to our client that his extradition case is one of the strongest they've ever seen, from an English perspective.

Having said that, there's always been a presumption from the moment we have engaged with the prosecutors here that if charged, Mike would come, stand trial, and seek to be vindicated.

What has changed is the Invoke/Darktrace investigation.
We are formal strangers to that, as the Court knows. These are independent companies with independent counsel. But it's relevant to us, because we see three things.

One, we see that it seems obvious that the government is going to supersede here. That the charges presently extant will not be the charges that finally go to trial. That's number one.

And number two, it seems from our perspective -- and obviously, it's a grand jury investigation. We don't know what they are doing; we don't know what their evidence is. We -- we know, we've had conversations with them. And from our perspective, the gravamen of this investigation is that somehow, some way, our client's purchase of stock from these companies to generate legal fees for the Keker law firm is

somehow hush money, somehow an obstruction of justice, somehow money laundering.

And let me say immediately, John Keker is a long-time friend of mine, he's one of my heroes. I got him into this case. I wanted his law firm to be paid for the work they did. So if there's a hush-money obstruction going on here, I'm guilty of it, too.

We find these allegations, frankly, Your Honor, absurd.

We cannot believe that the U.S. Attorney's office here is entertaining the possibility that the payment of legal fees to the Keker law firm is the equivalent of an obstruction of justice.

And again, this is how we see it. We don't know what's going on in the grand jury, but --

THE COURT: Well, when you say how you see it, have you been privy to any of the filings in this case in connection with the -- in connection with the subpoenas?

MR. WEINGARTEN: What is true, Your Honor, is every -- basically everything I know has come from the prosecutors when we advocated to them not to indict Mike Lynch. That almost entirely informs my opinion.

THE COURT: Are you telling me you haven't been privy to that?

MR. WEINGARTEN: I personally have not.

THE COURT: Well, I mean, you, personally. You have three

lawyers out there. I mean, I'm talking about have the defense been privy to any of the information that's contained in the filings in connection with the -- in connection with the subpoenas which are presently being litigated to which you are referring?

MR. WEINGARTEN: I don't want to answer one way or another until I consult with Mr. Morvillo. Mr. Morvillo -- we have become -- absolutely -- we've had conversations with --

THE COURT: The reason I ask the question --

MR. WEINGARTEN: Yes.

THE COURT: -- is because I don't believe, though I can be refreshed on this, that I've seen anything to suggest the -- to suggest that the inquiry is focused on exactly what you've said is your concern.

There are -- there are many concerns out there, and I'm going to address them on the 13th in connection with the subpoenas. But -- you know, and this is not really the time to try to air what is the justification or the direction of the investigation.

You say: Well, it's clear to you that they are going to get a superseding indictment. I have no idea. You may be right. Wasn't clear to me.

But you may be absolutely correct. And I don't pretend to sit in the seat, knowing everything that the government believes to have occurred in fashioning -- in fashioning their

particular prosecution strategy. So I don't know. 1 But I do understand that -- well, I guess what I have to 2 ask you is: Why is any of this relevant? 3 MR. WEINGARTEN: And here's the answer. And the answer 4 5 is: we allow for the possibility that there's a superseding indictment, and we allow for the possibility that the 6 7 superseding indictment will contain charges that are not extraditable. And we allow for the possibility that the 8 decision whether or not to fight extradition would be different 9 10 once we see the superseding indictment. 11 So that -- when I was last here I made a -- I asked for a -- a modest ask. And I think I want to ask for another 12 modest ask. And the modest ask is as follows: Is that the 13 second the government says to us there's no superseding 14 15 indictment or there's a superseding indictment, we immediately make a judgment on the extradition issue. And then, for all 16 17 intents and purposes, we go forward. 18 And what I think -- I don't see the Court being 19 disadvantaged that way because --20 Well, disadvantaged. Number one, I spent one THE COURT: -- I've had one trial, which has taken a considerable period of 21 That defendant, by the way, is awaiting sentencing, as 22 time.

time. That defendant, by the way, is awaiting sentencing you're well aware.

MR. WEINGARTEN: Yes, yes.

23

24

25

THE COURT: Secondly, the disadvantage isn't personal to

the Court. Of course not. Because I -- I fill my day. It's not -- that's not a problem. I don't even go by the hour. It just happens that I'm occupied. So I'm not looking at it, either financially or academically, interesting.

But I have a lot of cases out there. There is a Congressional statute that tells us that we must move forward on criminal matters in an expeditious way.

MR. WEINGARTEN: Of course.

THE COURT: So I think -- I think, if what you are proposing is simply -- as I hear it -- and I shouldn't interrupt you because -- but I think I've heard you on this issue, that I should wait for either a superseding indictment or an indication by the government that they are not going to supersede.

MR. WEINGARTEN: Yes.

THE COURT: The Court is not willing to do that, because in the event they do supersede, --

MR. LINCENBERG: Yes.

THE COURT: -- you are entitled -- there are remedies.

They are entitled to further continuances. You may be entitled to further -- further proceedings relating to that.

As to extradition, I'm not quite sure I hear exactly what your position is on that. You are suggesting to me that there may be very valid defenses that can be asserted with respect to extradition, to which I say: I haven't the slightest idea.

1 MR. WEINGARTEN: Right. 2 THE COURT: There may be and there may not be. I don't I do think -- and I could be wrong in this, but you can 3 correct me -- that if he were to -- as an example, to waive 4 5 extradition, he would waive extradition on the present 6 indictment. I don't think he waives as to a superseding indictment. 7 MR. WEINGARTEN: Does not. 8 9 THE COURT: Am I wrong? MR. WEINGARTEN: 10 No. 11 THE COURT: I'm right. 12 MR. WEINGARTEN: Yes. 13 **THE COURT:** Okay. I'm batting about 50 percent. anyway, that would be the case. So we preserve that right. 14 15 But I'm not here to encourage him to waive indictment or not. 16 And putting aside just for the moment his health concerns, 17 which are of concern --MR. WEINGARTEN: Of course. 18 Putting those aside, it seems to me, from what 19 THE COURT: 20 I understand in your case, you are quite correct that 21 extradition now takes a fairly lengthy time, or lengthier, to put it in -- time to proceed. 22 23 So my view is that the United States Attorney's office, in their judgment, because I think that's a question of 24

prosecution judgment -- not entirely, since there's a pending

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
case -- but in their judgment, they should move forward on the
extradition proceedings, in the event that your client has
chosen, at whatever date we'll look at, not to appear here
voluntarily. He doesn't have to appear voluntarily.
    But I'm not going to sit around and wait for him -- I'm
not going to wait for the government to decide whether or not
they're going to supersede.
     Maybe that's the short answer. I am going to give due
deference and consideration to his health conditions, because I
think that that's something well beyond his control. And also
from a humanitarian point of view, they have to be considered.
                      (Nods head)
    MR. WEINGARTEN:
     THE COURT: But it is my intention -- I want to be direct
          My intention is to move as quickly as the process
with you.
would -- would permit in -- Mr. Weingarten.
    MR. WEINGARTEN: Can I just say, maybe I misunderstood.
Last time I was here, I got the understanding that the Court
was okay with the civil trial proceeding first in England.
     THE COURT:
                 I still am.
    MR. WEINGARTEN:
                      Okay.
                No, no, you have the right impression.
     THE COURT:
    MR. WEINGARTEN:
                      Okay.
                But you see, there is this thing called
     THE COURT:
"multi-task."
     MR. WEINGARTEN:
                      Okay.
```

THE COURT: And it seems to me that -- that -- you know, I'm not at all suggesting that I would set a trial date this year.

What I'm suggesting is what I would do -- and I'm glad
Mr. Chamberlain is here, though I haven't heard his views on
the subject. But subject to his views on the subject, I would
set a trial date, I would -- the setting of the trial date will
occur as quickly as I can do it. That is, as soon as he's
here, I will set a trial date. But that trial date will be a
function of everything else that's going on.

MR. WEINGARTEN: Okay.

THE COURT: The civil trial that's going on. The -perhaps some health considerations, over time. Also, of
course, the evidence. You have to look at the evidence. You
have to be prepared for trial. So all that is in the future.

What is not in the distant future is the process of setting a trial date.

MR. WEINGARTEN: Can I try one more thing, if I may?

THE COURT: Try as many as you want.

MR. WEINGARTEN: Thanks.

Let's say hypothetically the Court said to the prosecutors: You have 90 days or 120 days to supercede. And obviously, you've done that in the past with prosecutors, I assume. Other judges have done that.

That period of time, civil case in London gets under way,

Mike Lynch is fully engaged in London. The proceeding here is not compromised one bit. We learn, at the end of 90 days or 120 days, what the charges we're actually going to face are going to be.

As I stand before you today, there's a presumption that Mike Lynch is coming to the United States to stand trial and seek to be vindicated.

But let's say that we see something in the superseding indictment, and the barristers say: This is crazy, he can't be extradited for this, the courts in London will see it X, Y and Z. Shouldn't he make a decision as whether or not to fight extradition, such an important decision, with the benefit of the knowledge of what he's actually going to be charged with? And if the prosecutors at the end of 90 days or 120 days say: We're not superseding, voilà, we're here.

THE COURT: Well, the answer to your question is: Yes, you're absolutely correct that judges have, from time to time -- and I have -- said you either supersede it 90 days or whatever it is, or we're proceeding on the current indictment. But they say that -- at least I do -- in the context of a trial date, an impending trial date, in which if there is an superseding indictment, it's going to throw the trial date completely off by virtue -- by virtue of the superseding indictment.

In this case, that doesn't seem to be the case, since

we're talking about a trial date basically a year from now.

So, it could happen, because nobody's seen the charges.

You know, if they come in, if I set the trial for January 15th, and they came in December 15th with the superseding indictment, believe me, you'd hear from me. I mean, you'd like to hear from me at that point.

But I don't know whether that's going to happen. I don't know whether it's intended. I don't know what the grand jury has found or not found. I don't know how the whole thing is going to play out.

So, any other thoughts?

MR. WEINGARTEN: Just the --

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. WEINGARTEN: Just the Hobbsonian choice that we face here. We know it's in the indictment. And you know, Mike Lynch, if he's a British citizen, he has to make a decision yea or nay. We got that. We understand that completely. But it's a critically important decision, and he's got a lot of people in England telling him a variety of things, including really smart barristers.

So all we're asking for is for him to have the opportunity to make that decision, based on full information.

THE COURT: Well, I understand that argument. But I mean, your argument about full information is that he should see the superseding indictment, if there is one, before making that

decision.

And my view on that is that he shouldn't have -- is that I'm not prepared to give him that luxury. First of all, I must tell you, I think my powers are quite limited in telling the government what to do about superseding indictments. There may be extraordinary conditions.

And maybe you suggest this is one, but I don't think so.

I've never heard this argument in this context. But I'm not

blaming you for being creative. But I've never heard that as

to why I should direct the government to file a -- their

superseding indictment on or before a particular date. So I'm

not going to do it.

Number two, I think it is almost exclusively within the realm of the executive branch whether -- how to proceed on charges. And whenever I've stuck my toe into it, or finger, or whatever one wants to call it, I have been reminded, and properly so, that's not the function of the court. So I'm not going to set down those kinds of deadlines.

What I'm concerned about here, in addition to the fairness of the proceeding, I'm also concerned about the progress of the proceeding. And -- because I do have one defendant awaiting sentencing. I have a second defendant who now appears in front of me today. And to be fair, to be honest, to be obvious, I would rather not have three trials in this case.

There may be reasons, by the way, which, I have no idea

about severance. I have no view on it, don't know the evidence, don't know the arguments and so forth. So, I'm setting those aside. But in the normal course, I would want to try Mr. Chamberlain and Dr. Lynch at the same time. There may be reasons not to. I don't know.

But one reason may or may not be that he is -- that he is sitting in England, listening to his British barristers, who I'm sure are outstanding -- though they're probably not as good as the American barristers -- but -- and you won't dispute that. No. At least, not on --

MR. WEINGARTEN: Not in public.

THE COURT: Okay. So anyway, I don't know how that's going to go.

But I think the appropriate thing -- I think I have to hear from Mr. Chamberlain, from Mr. Lincenberg, on where they are on this whole issue, if they have a view.

MR. WEINGARTEN: Okay.

THE COURT: And then I'll try to figure out what to do.

MR. LINCENBERG: Honestly, Your Honor, I'm not sure what view we have. But if it gets into --

THE COURT: Well, a view as to -- listen. Not going ask you your view as to extradition, so forth. No. I want your view as to a trial.

In other words, I want to know when you think, in the ordinary course, you will be prepared to go to trial in this

case.

MR. LINCENBERG: Well, I'm not sure. I think it probably would be some time in 2020. But the only -- the only comment I had to the discussion that's taken place is that it sounds like it's all relevant to the setting of dates. That, for example, if there's going to be a superseding indictment, whether or not it affects Mr. Chamberlain or not, it sounds like it affects a trial he might be a part of.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. LINCENBERG: And so, you know, to the extent that there was more information, it would help in the setting of trial dates.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. LINCENBERG: (Shruqs shoulders)

THE COURT: I understand that. But I've expressed my views as to that. But you're expressing a view, if I understand correctly, that you would not insist on the Speedy Trial Act in -- in bringing this case to trial within 70 days.

MR. LINCENBERG: Oh, that -- that's correct.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. LINCENBERG: This is a complex case that we're going to be behind the ball on --

THE COURT: So I don't have a situation where one defendant is saying: I want my trial as soon as possible, and the other defendant is saying: I don't even know whether I'm

going to show up for the trial. I don't have that situation. 1 2 MR. LINCENBERG: That's correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. All right. So that can help me -- that 3 was -- that's only my concern, because then I can put you in 4 5 the same time pot as Dr. Lynch. Same period. MR. LINCENBERG: (Nods head) 6 7 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Reeves. You have some views on this whole thing? 8 9 MR. REEVES: Yes, I do. I would like to begin with a request that time be excluded as to --10 11 THE COURT: Yes, it's a complex case. And of course, one 12 defendant has not appeared. 13 MR. REEVES: Okay. So thank you, Your Honor. Second, I think rather than sort of predict or guess, 14 frankly, about whether there's additional charges or what 15 16 action a grand jury may or may not take, I would ask and 17 inquire why Dr. Lynch can't simply follow the same procedure that Mr. Chamberlain has followed, agree to come voluntarily to 18 the United States when he's able to do so. 19 Counsel said that he would be able to travel in three 20 weeks. Why can't we set the case for four weeks out, on March 21 4th, for Dr. Lynch to appear and be arraigned on the existing 22 23 indictment? That's what we would ask for, please. THE COURT: Mr. Weingarten. 24

MR. WEINGARTEN: Well, I mean, I don't want to overstay my

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
welcome, and I don't want to repeat myself. I mean, for
Dr. Lynch, the decision whether or not to fight extradition is
a real one. And he's retained counsel to advise him.
     To us, everything turns -- the pivot upon which this
decision turns for now, because I think we crossed the bridge
before the Invoke/Darktrace investigation got under way, was
we're here. So now, again, the modest ask is to give us an
opportunity to see what --
     THE COURT: Here's what I'm missing.
     MR. WEINGARTEN: Yes.
     THE COURT: Maybe you can fill it in for me.
     MR. WEINGARTEN: Yes.
     THE COURT: I hear -- what Mr. Reeves is saying --
     MR. LINCENBERG:
                      Yes.
     THE COURT:
                -- as I hear it is: The decision on waiving
extradition --
     MR. WEINGARTEN:
                      Yes.
     THE COURT: -- is made on the basis of the indictment as
it stands today.
                  (Nods head)
     MR. REEVES:
     MR. WEINGARTEN: Yes.
                        That -- now, if people are telling him
     THE COURT:
                Okay.
that that indictment -- and that's what -- I heard a little bit
of what you said --
     MR. WEINGARTEN:
                     Yes.
```

THE COURT: -- is subject to -- the extradition is subject 1 2 to challenge --MR. WEINGARTEN: For sure. 3 THE COURT: -- based upon that indictment. 4 5 MR. WEINGARTEN: For sure. THE COURT: Okay. He'll either have to decide to 6 7 challenge it, or not. 8 MR. WEINGARTEN: But -- sorry. 9 THE COURT: If he -- well, I understand why you might want to know everything else that's out there. But it's also clear 10 11 to me that if he were to waive indictment on those charges, he doesn't waive indictment on any superseding indictment. 12 13 MR. REEVES: Extradition --14 THE COURT: Yeah, pardon me. Extradition on a superseding 15 indictment. So he preserves -- he preserves those claims. 16 Now, he would give up -- and I'm not about to advise him, 17 but obviously he's going to give up whatever challenges he has to the present extradition. Defense of extradition. 18 think he has to make that decision now. 19 And I think that it does make sense to continue this for 20 four weeks. We'll pick a day. He can travel on a Sunday or 21 any day that's convenient, and appear in court, and leave the 22 That's not -- that's not an issue. 23 same day. MR. WEINGARTEN: Okay, I -- I -- unrelated point. 24

a trial that commences in Dallas on March 6th. So what I would

```
like is to consult with his physicians and perhaps suggest a
 1
     different date, so that I could be here.
 2
          THE COURT: Well, I want you here.
 3
          MR. WEINGARTEN: Thank you.
 4
 5
                     That's not a question.
          THE COURT:
          MR. REEVES: March 11th would also be fine.
 6
 7
          MR. WEINGARTEN: It would have -- for me to be here, it's
     a long trial in Dallas. For me to be here --
 8
                     Who's it in front of?
 9
          THE COURT:
          MR. WEINGARTEN: Judge Lindsay.
10
11
          THE COURT:
                     Judge Lindsay.
12
          MR. WEINGARTEN: Sam Lindsay.
13
          THE COURT: Federal judge?
          MR. WEINGARTEN:
14
                           Yeah.
15
                     Judge Lindsay. I don't know Judge Lindsay.
          THE COURT:
          I'm sure Judge Lindsay is a great judge, and may possibly
16
17
     accommodate a brief appearance --
          MR. WEINGARTEN: Okay, we can try.
18
          THE COURT: -- in San Francisco, either on a Friday or a
19
20
              I'm going to give you some flexibility. I want -- I
21
     want you to be here, either with or without your client, on
    March 1, March 4th, March 8th or March 11th.
22
23
          MR. WEINGARTEN: Okay.
          THE COURT: And as far as his health concerns, if those
24
25
     dates are agreeable -- you don't have to send me anything about
```

1 his health. I accept your representation. That's good enough for me. 2 MR. WEINGARTEN: Thank you. 3 THE COURT: And -- you know. But if it turns out that his 4 5 health care prevents him from going at that time, then I would 6 want a pretty detailed explanation of what's going on. 7 MR. WEINGARTEN: Of course. THE COURT: Now, Mr. Lincenberg, what about you? 8 MR. LINCENBERG: In terms of those dates? 9 I want them both here together. 10 THE COURT: Yeah. 11 MR. LINCENBERG: What --THE COURT: Or, if Mr. Lynch is not going to be here, I 12 13 want Mr. Chamberlain here. Because we have got to get this thing going. 14 15 (Off-the-Record discussion between counsel) 16 MR. LINCENBERG: Your Honor, those dates are not all good 17 for me, but I think I could have my partner here, if need be. Good. All I'm going to do -- what I'm going 18 THE COURT: to try to do is set a date, set a trial date, a motions date. 19 And I may say something about discovery, too. 20 I may give some requirements of the government about 21 furnishing information and so forth. I don't know what you 22 23 presently have. But there's a lot of discovery in this case. A lot of it, I'm quite sure, is known to you. But there may be 24 25 things unknown. And I'm going to direct that a certain amount

```
of that --
 1
          MR. LINCENBERG: Judge, can I make one request? Is there
 2
     a time before March 1, like a couple of days in February?
 3
     Because I know March 1 --
 4
 5
                      Sure. If you do an earlier day, that's fine.
          THE COURT:
          MR. WEINGARTEN:
                           Okay.
 6
 7
                     Just agree amongst yourselves. Okay?
          THE COURT:
                 Everybody gets along, and gets dates -- doesn't
 8
     surprises.
     have to worry about the --
 9
10
          MR. WEINGARTEN: Okay.
11
          THE COURT:
                     -- the "Aha" factor.
          MR. REEVES: Your Honor, I think we're going to need time
12
13
     excluded as to Mr. Chamberlain through a specific date.
     could have a minute to perhaps confer with counsel about a date
14
15
16
          THE COURT:
                     Go right ahead.
17
                       Thank you.
          MR. REEVES:
          (Off-the-Record discussion between counsel)
18
          MR. WEINGARTEN: Perhaps if we look at February 27th, if
19
20
     the Court has time then?
21
          THE COURT:
                     February 27th.
                       That would be fine for the government,
22
          MR. REEVES:
23
     Your Honor.
                     We will be in trial. So do you want to come
24
          THE CLERK:
25
     late in the afternoon, 4:00?
```

```
1
          MR. LINCENBERG:
                           Sure.
                       That's fine for the government.
 2
          MR. REEVES:
          MR. LINCENBERG: That's fine with us.
 3
                      If you need to change it, call Ms. Scott.
 4
          THE COURT:
 5
          MR. WEINGARTEN: Okay.
                                  Thank you.
          MR. LINCENBERG: Does Mr. Chamberlain need to be here for
 6
 7
     that?
                       (Inaudible)
 8
          MR. REEVES:
                     I want him here, if -- well, look. Let's see,
 9
          THE COURT:
     do I need him here? Mr. Lynch is not here. I think the answer
10
11
     is yes.
          Well, I'm trying to figure out -- I need to hear -- I
12
13
     need -- I need Mr. Chamberlain to be here when I give a trial
     date. Now, the question is: Am I going to give a trial date
14
     on -- if -- if Dr. Lynch isn't here, would I give a trial date?
15
16
          And the reason I need to give a trial date, among other
17
     things, is that all the lawyers get busy.
          (Off-the-Record discussion between counsel)
18
19
          THE COURT:
                     And then: No, I can't do it next month, or I
     can't do it six months from -- yes.
20
21
          MR. REEVES: Well, I think the parties can probably confer
     about all of this, Your Honor.
22
23
                     Why don't you work it out.
          THE COURT:
          MR. REEVES:
                       Yeah.
24
          MR. LINCENBERG: Also, counsel had a good idea that if
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: (Inaudible)

```
Mister -- if Mr. Lynch is going to be here, that
Mr. Chamberlain should be here as well.
     MR. REEVES:
                  Yes.
                 I agree with that.
     THE COURT:
     MR. LINCENBERG: Otherwise --
     THE COURT: Otherwise, I don't want people going back and
forth and back and forth and back and forth.
     MR. LINCENBERG: Right.
     THE COURT:
                Yeah.
     MR. REEVES: So we will adjourn the case to February 27 --
     THE COURT:
                And I should also point out, because I think
it will be a concern, is that a lot of proceedings could be
done without the presence of the client, assuming he executes a
waiver, and is advised of it. I'm not -- you know.
     Obviously -- not talking about a trial, but I am talking
about a lot of motions work and so forth and so on, disputes
and so forth. As far as I'm concerned, as long as they're
notified of it, and they decide -- and elect not to come, they
don't have to come.
     MR. LINCENBERG: And Your Honor, if the Court wants to do
that orally, right now, we'd be happy to do that.
                Well, I would like to get everybody here.
     MR. LINCENBERG: Okay, just in terms of a waiver of
appearance, but --
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LINCENBERG: Okay. I don't want to change the subject. I have a small point, just to clarify --Let me take up Mr. Lincenberg's point. THE COURT: Mr. Chamberlain, would you come up for just a moment, please? (Request complied with by the defendant) THE COURT: I don't know whether you appreciated exactly what I said, but let me just go through it one more time. You have a right, as I indicated, to be here at all In other words, anything that occurs in your proceedings. case, you're entitled to be here in open court, to observe, to -- to counsel with your attorney, to take positions, all of those things, you're entitled to be here. You're also, with leave of the Court, that is, with my permission, not required to be here for certain proceedings. Because as long as your attorney, your representatives are here, then that's something that I can deal with in terms of whatever is discussed with them. Now, what the process will be will be your counsel will advise you that: On such and such a date, there will be a court hearing on such and such a matter. Do you wish to be here or do you not wish to be here? And that will be your election, after you discuss it with And you are free not to be here. No action will be counsel. taken in connection with your failure to appear. Do you understand that?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DEFENDANT CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, I do, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. And I think that that -- just as an accommodation, it is less disruptive to your life if that process is followed. MR. LINCENBERG: We appreciate that, Your Honor. THE COURT: Oh, that's okay. That's all right. DEFENDANT CHAMBERLAIN: Thank you. THE COURT: The least I can do. MR. LINCENBERG: I wanted to make one quick correction. THE COURT: Yes, go right ahead. MR. LINCENBERG: The bond as it was prepared, the Hussain bond was \$1,000, unsecured. THE COURT: Yeah. MR. LINCENBERG: And as the bond was being prepared, it was prepared differently. The clerk initialed it out and changed it to \$1,000, unsecured. Because it's now a messy bond form (Indicating), I just wanted to state that for the record. THE COURT: Fine. Messy. It's messy. This whole case is messy. MR. REEVES: So long as it's accurate, and I think it is, Your Honor. One last detail. In the event that Dr. Lynch does not come, et cetera, on February 27th, and in the event then that

the case is adjourned further as to Mr. Chamberlain, I think

1 the government agrees it doesn't make sense for him to travel at that time, and will inform the Court --2 THE COURT: No. 3 MR. REEVES: -- that that would extend the case; it may 4 5 need to extend the exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial 6 This is a very complicated case. I think it's important 7 to build a record about the appropriateness of the exclusion, and the possibility that we would be excluding time from today, 8 through that appearance, to a future date set by the Court. 9 MR. LINCENBERG: I think that makes sense. Can I have one 10 11 minute to explain to my client --12 THE COURT: Yeah. 13 MR. LINCENBERG: -- what all that means? MR. FRENTZEN: Before the explanation, if I could, I 14 15 believe -- and I'm going on memory here, Your Honor, but I 16 believe the Speedy Trial Act also has an exclusion for getting 17 co-defendants together in the same case. And so I think that would also be appropriate to put on the record. 18 19 Thank you. MR. REEVES: So I'm belt, and he's suspenders. 20 MR. LINCENBERG: Let me just take one --21 (Off-the-Record discussion between counsel and defendant) 22 23 MR. LINCENBERG: I've consulted with my client, and my client is certainly willing to exclude time, as Mr. Reeves has 24

```
1
          THE COURT:
                     Thank you.
                                  All right.
 2
                       Thank you, Your Honor.
          MR. REEVES:
          THE COURT:
                      Thank you.
 3
          Mr. Weingarten.
 4
 5
          MR. WEINGARTEN: Just one quick point. Since the case is
 6
     adjourned until the end of February, I assume no extradition
 7
    proceedings will commence. I know the Court has limited power
     on that subject as well. But I would like it on the record.
 8
                     I can't -- I can't give that assurance,
 9
          THE COURT:
    because it's not within the Court to give that assurance.
10
11
    However, I will tell you that it will be the Court's view that
     extradition ought to proceed expeditiously, in the event that
12
13
     your client does not appear.
                           I -- I'm not surprised to hear that.
14
          MR. WEINGARTEN:
15
          THE COURT:
                     Not surprised. Oh, all right.
16
          MR. WEINGARTEN: But I'm worried about from now until
17
     February 27.
          THE COURT: Well, that's something for you to talk to him
18
                I can't -- I'm not going to broker a deal.
19
     about it.
                You know people in the U.S. Attorney's office?
20
     sit down.
                           I do. I watched the Super Bowl with one.
21
          MR. WEINGARTEN:
          THE COURT: So talk to Mr. Reeves, Mr. Frentzen,
22
23
                 They're all fine lawyers. And --
    Mr. Leach.
          MR. LINCENBERG: Okay.
24
25
          MR. REEVES: I do think that's the right remedy,
```

```
Your Honor. And I am happy to confer with counsel about it, as
 1
 2
     we have on this matter in the past. But no, the government is
     not going to make a representation one way or the other.
 3
 4
          THE COURT:
                      Okay.
 5
          MR. REEVES:
                       Anything else?
                      Well, that's usually my question.
 6
          THE COURT:
 7
          MR. REEVES:
                       Okay.
          (Off-the-Record discussion between the Court and Clerk)
 8
          (The Court signs document)
 9
10
          THE COURT:
                      Okay. Anything else?
11
          MR. REEVES: Nothing for the government.
                     Okay, thank you very much for coming in.
12
          THE COURT:
                       Thank Your Honor.
13
          MR. REEVES:
                         Thank you, Your Honor.
14
          MR. FRENTZEN:
15
          MR. WEINGARTEN:
                           Thank you.
16
          (Proceedings concluded)
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I, BELLE BALL, Official Reporter for the United States Court, Northern District of California, hereby certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. Bell Ball /s/ Belle Ball Belle Ball, CSR 8785, CRR, RDR Monday, February 4, 2019